



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

(111)

**CRM-M-18289-2026
DATE OF DECISION: 06.04.2026**

Taranjit Singh @ Roddu

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present Mr.Navraj Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.
Mr.Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 BNSS, 2023 seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner in a case bearing FIR No.124 dated 10.09.2025, under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 118(1), 118(2), 191(3) and 190 of BNS, 2023, registered at Police Station Kathgarh, District SBS Nagar, Punjab.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the present FIR dated 10.09.2025 has been registered on the statement of complainant Bhola Nath, a milk vendor, alleging that on 07.09.2025 at about 06:30 PM near Imli Ware Rattewal, he was intercepted by seven persons armed with kirpans and dandas, out of whom some were identified including the present petitioner Taranjit Singh @ Roddu. It is alleged that the petitioner inflicted a kirpan blow on the complainant's right hand when he attempted to defend himself, and thereafter the complainant was further assaulted by the co-accused. Upon raising alarm, public persons gathered at the spot, due to which all the accused fled away with their respective weapons.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case due to prior enmity; that as per the FIR, only a single kirpan blow is attributed to the petitioner, which allegedly hit the complainant on a non-vital part i.e. right hand, and the same does not indicate any intention to cause death nor constitutes a grievous or life-threatening injury; that there is no allegation of repeated assault and the occurrence appears to be a sudden fight without premeditation; that the FIR contains general and omnibus allegations against multiple accused, thereby reflecting exaggeration; that similarly situated co-accused have already been granted anticipatory bail and the case of the petitioner stands on better footing; the petitioner has clean antecedents and is not involved in any other case, hence, learned counsel prayed for anticipatory bail as the petitioner is ready to join the investigation.

3. Notice of motion.

4. In pursuance of advance notice, Mr. Anup Singh, AAG, Punjab, appeared on behalf of respondent-State and submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature and specifically supported by the statement of the complainant; that the petitioner has been duly named and attributed a specific role of inflicting a kirpan blow, which is a deadly weapon, thereby attracting stringent provisions of law; that the plea of false implication cannot be considered at this stage as it shall be decided during trial after appreciating evidence adduced by both parties; that the injury, though stated to be on the hand, has been caused by a sharp-edged weapon and reflects the violent conduct of the petitioner; that the occurrence was not a mere sudden quarrel but a pre-planned attack by a group of armed persons;



parity with co-accused is not applicable as the role attributed to the petitioner is distinct and more specific, as out of total eleven injuries, two are caused by sharp edged weapon, nine are caused by blunt weapon and one has been declared grievous which is attributed to the present petitioner; and that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for recovery of weapon and to unearth the true facts, therefore, the petitioner does not deserve the concession of anticipatory bail.

5. Heard.

6. Keeping in view the specific allegations levelled against the petitioner that are serious in nature, wherein the petitioner has been specifically attributed the role of inflicting an injury with a kirpan, a sharp-edged weapon. The complainant has categorically named the petitioner and assigned a distinct role to him in the occurrence. At this stage, the plea of false implication and contradictions in the prosecution case cannot be considered and are to be adjudicated during trial. The contention that the injury is on a non-vital part does not dilute the gravity of the offence, particularly when the same has been caused with a deadly weapon. The plea of parity with co-accused is also not tenable in view of the specific role attributed to the petitioner. Custodial interrogation of petitioner is imperative for recovery of the weapon and for effective investigation.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has emphasized the importance of custodial interrogation *in case titled as 'CBI Vs. Anil Sharma, 1997 AIR Supreme Court 3806' decided on 03.08.1997*, by holding that many useful informations and concealed materials may be elicited from a suspect in



custody, than a suspect who is well-protected by an order of anticipatory bail, in which case, interrogation may be reduced to a mere ritual.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds no ground to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and the present petition stands dismissed.

9. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed to be an expression of opinion by this Court lest it may prejudice the trial. The learned trial Court is directed to proceed with the trial on its own merits, strictly in accordance with law.

06.04.2026	(SUBHAS MEHLA)
mamta	JUDGE
Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No